THE BOUNDARIES
OF
THE ANDHRA PROVINCE

BY

'KOWSIKA'

THE BOUNDARIES
OF
THE ANDHRA PROVINCE

BY

'KOWSIKA'

WITH A FOREWORD BY

Sri K. BHASHYAM, B. A., B. L., M. L. A.

ANBU NILAYAM
Publishers & Booksellers
RAMACHANDRAPURAM (P. O.)
Pudukkottai State.

FIRST PUBLISHED: 1947
1000 Copies

Price Rupee One

Printed at RAJAJI PRESS, Ltd., DEVAKOTTAI
For ANBU NILAYAM, Publishers
Ramachandrapuram, (Pudukkottai State)

FOREWORD

This small book written by "*Kowsika*" is a vigorous refutation of the claim made by Andhras to the Madras City. Indeed, he carries the war into the enemy's camp and proves conclusively the validity of the claim of the Tamils to the territory up to Pennar in Nellore. The question is examined in all aspects, from the historical, traditional, cultural and linguistic points of view. The author has given wealth of details supported by authorities-a contribution very valuable to the Tamil cause. His complaint is that while the Andhras conscious of the weakness of their case have been aggressively claiming Madras, like the Sudetan Germans, the Tamils have been complacent so far, hoping for the matter being settled peacefully by a Boundary Commission.

In recent times, the question has become a burning topic of the day and the publication of this work is timely. The author trenchantly deals with the arguments of the stalwarts of the Andhra cause, such as Sri. V. Ramadas Pantulu, Sir S. Radhakrishnan and Sri Vavilla Venkateswarlu. The last has evidently forgotten his Tamil origin. Indeed, he and his family have contributed not a little for the Andhra literature. The absurdity of the claim of the Andhras to the Madras City on the ground it was conceded by the Rajah of Chandragiri is exposed. In fact, the grant was only of a few acres on the coast and even that grant had to be abandoned and a fresh one obtained from the next conqueror, the Nawab of Arcot.

FOREWORD

All this is beside the point, when we look at the principle on which the provinces have to be demarcated. It is the people of the locality, their culture and their language that are the determining factors *and not* the racial character of the Ruler in which case, our country must remain a British territory for all time. The Congress resolution makes the point clear and it is only on the linguistic basis, the demarcation of the provinces should be made. The dust and din created by the aggressive Andhras has produced a cloud on the issue. This book comes as a sunbeam piercing the clouds, and shows how fantastic and how unreal is the claim of the Andhras to the Madras City. Indeed, they do not stop with it, but also claim some portions of Chingleput, north of Madras, so as to serve as a Danzig Corridor to the City.

The contribution is all the more valuable coming as it does from a gentleman who is not himself an active politician, but a retired recluse. The time and leisure at his disposal, he has spent usefully to study the problems from all aspects and give us the benefit of the unbiassed result of his investigations.

The book must be in the hands of every Tamilian, interested in his Nadu. *It must also be in the hands of Andhras for them to realise, if they will, the injustice of their demand.*

K BHASHYAM,
Champak Vilas, Luz, Mylapore,
Madras.

17-10-1947.

THE BOUNDARIES OF THE ANDHRA PROVINCE

INTRODUCTORY

The formation of a separate Andhra Province is no longer a mattet for excited agitation. The need for redistributing provinces on a linguistic basis was recognised by the Congress as early as the Nehru report, and the Congress has organised its own machinery by forming provincial Committees on a linguistic basis. A series of accidents combined to postpone the fulfilment of this reform, but this unfortunate delay has been attributed by the Andhras to a conspiracy of the Tamils to defeat their aspirations. This suspicion has poisoned the relations between the two peoples and has formed a contributory current in the whirl of recent politics. Hence the sooner the division is made the healthier will be public life in South India. It is hoped that the new Government of India will immediately appoint the necessary commission to re-form the existing provinces into new ones based on linguistic and cultural affinities and proceed to the appointment of boundary commissions to demarcate the boundaries of Andhra, Tamil, Kerala, and Carnatic provinces.

BOUNDARIES

The Andhras will soon have their own province and we wish them every joy from it. But with all our general goodwill towards them we cannot concede their unreasonable demands for the cession of Tamil territory or consent to the partition of Madras. On the question of boundaries there is bound to be difference of opinion, but whether this difference developes into cleavage or antagonism will depend upon the Andhras themselves. The Tamils did not raise the question of boundaries, for they knew that a partition could be effected only after a delimitation of boundaries by an impartial commission and when the time came they could present their case to this commission through lawyers and there was no need for angry passions or recriminations. Conscious of their own reasonableness in this regard they were not apprehensive of injustice to them. But the Andhras have put fourth aggressive and even fantastic claims and are mobilising Andhra public opinion in their support, possibly with a view to forcing the hands of the boundary commission. Perhaps they are deliberately pitching their demands too high as vantage ground for future bargaining. It was only recently that the Tamils awoke to the danger of passivity and silence against these militant tactics of the Andhras, and the Tamil Nadu Congress Committee emphatically declared its opposition to the unfair proposals of Andhra leaders regarding boundaries. But even today public opinion in

Tamil Nadu has not been sufficiently mobilised to resist them, as the ordinary Tamilian has a pathetic faith in the justice of his cause and its ultimate triumph.

The most plausible presentation of the Andhra demands is to be found in a brochure prepared by the late Mr. V. Ramadas Pantulu and published by the Andhra Provincial Congress Committee. What are these demands and how far do they square with the legitimate interests of the Tamils? In page twenty-two of this brochure Mr. Ramadas Pantulu prefaces his discussion of the question of boundaries with these wise words: "we are resting our respective cases on a very tangible factor viz,, the proportion of the population speaking a particular language. The Andhras never claimed and would never claim any areas which are not inhabited by a majority of people speaking Telugu as their mother tongue and which are not contiguous to the Telugu Districts". Mr. Ramadas Pantulu here enunciates two principles which should govern the adjudication of all boundary disputes, the language spoken by the majority of people in the area, and the country to which it is contiguous. And these principles he rigorously applies to the Tamil claims (based on historical grounds) for the southern portion of Chittoor District up to the Tirupati Hills and summarily dismisses them as untenable. He is prepared to apply them to the bilingual districts of Bellary and Ganjam. But when he comes to Madras and the northern portion of Chinglepet,

he throws these principles overboard and against all dictates of reason and fair-play seeks to annex them to the Andhra Province. Madras has a majority of Tamil-speaking people and is surrounded by a preponderantly Tamil area. The very principles which Mr. Ramdas enunciates rule out the Andhra claim for these two areas and so he shifts his ground and bases his claim to these areas on supposed historical associations. We expect a responsible leader like Ramdas Pantulu, at least to be consistent if he cannot be fair and equitable. But he appeals now to one principle and now to another, shifting his ground and juggling with his standards at the dictate of self-interest and in scorn of justice and reason.

THE ANDHRA CLAIM TO MADRAS

Though the Andhra agitation for a separate province is a quarter of a century old, the demand for Madras is of recent origin. It was at the Twentieth Session of the Andhra Maha Sabha held in Madras in October 1938 that the Andhras first put forth the claim for the location of the capital of the future Andhra Province in Madras. Till very recently the headquarters of the Andhra Provincial Congress Committee used to be at Bezwada, and this was no accident. People came to regard Bezwada as the capital of the future Andhra Province. Even in the Sri Bagh Pact, a pact approved by the Andhra Provincial Congress Committee, there was no thought of making Madras their capital. For one of the clauses of the pact is

"while the University may continue to be where it is, the High Court and the Metropolis be located in suitable places in the Coastal Districts and the Rayalaseema, the choice being given to the Rayalaseema". What has happened since then to excite the Andhra appetite for Madras? It was the growing opposition of people in the Ceded Districts to any scheme of partition which would cut them off from the cultural capital of South India, Madras, and the fear of mutual jealousies between Rayalaseema and the Coastal Districts, the fear that under the terms of the Sri Bagh Pact, Rayalaseema might ask for the location of the capital in one of its own town; it was this that made the astute Andhra leaders ask for Madras. Madras was to be the bait with which Rayalaseema was to be tempted, the price of peace and reconciliation between Rayalaseema and the Coastal Districts. True, Madras belongs to Tamil Nadu. But the Tamils must make the sacrifice to compose the domestic difference amomg Andhras. Rob Peter to pay Paul or rather coax Peter to pay your debt to Paul.

Mr. Ramadas Pantulu very generously says (P. 30 of the Memorandum) that the Andhras do not claim the City exclusively for themselves but only want a share of it, the northern half of the city which lies north of the river Cooum. But this generosity of Mr. Ramadas is a newborn sentiment, for there was a time when he stridently demanded that the City of Madras up to San Thome.

should be handed over to the Andhras and that the Tamil Province should begin from the fishermen's huts south of Mylapore. This shows how reasonable Mr. Ramadas could be !

The Grounds of The Andhra Claim

On what do the Andhras base their claim? Not on the number of Telugu speaking people in the city, the principle which they themselves propose to apply in the case of Nellore, Chittoor and Bellary. For according to the census of 1931, the only one for which official figures are available, out of a total population of 647,330 in the city of Madras, only 124,649 or about a fifth, speak Telugu, while 411,823 or nearly two thirds speak Tamil. The proportion of Tamils to Andhras is thus more than 3 to 1. Unable to get over this, Mr. Ramadas Pantulu casts doubts on the correctness of the census figures; but if once the census figures are doubted there is no basis for discussion at all and we have to wait till a referendum gives the correct figures. But the impatient Andhras will not wait till then and argue their case from guess and conjecture. If the Andhras contend that the census figure in the 1931 census is an under-estimate, it will be equally open to others to argue that it is an over-estimate.

Next Mr. Ramadas Pantulu contends that "if correct census are now taken of the city of Madras, though the

Tamil population may constitute the single large group speaking one language, it will not constitute the majority of the population of Madras". That is, the Telugus, the Malayalees, Gujeratis, Marwaris, foreigners etc, taken together will outnumber the Tamils. We do not know on what he bases his hopes. According to the 1931 census the population of Madras, classified according to language, was as follows:—

Tamil speaking	411,823
Telugu ,,	124,629
Malayalam ,,	9,229
Oriya ,,	317
Kanarese ,,	4.539
Hindustani ,,	62,651
Other languages	34,022
Total	647,210

But of this total nearly two thirds, 411,823 are Tamils and all other linguistic groups put together form but a third. If we allow for normal growth of population and if there is only a normal movement of people then, there can never be a time in the next few decades when the Tamilian proportion of two thirds will become less than half. But Mr. Ramadas may have had secret sources of knowledge and his own private reasons for hoping for a Tamil minority in the next census. Grant purely for the sake of argument that the Tamils will not have a majority

over all the other communities combined, will it mean an Andhra majority?

The Tamils will still outnumber the Andhras. For contesting the claim of the Tamils to Madras, Mr. Ramadas would add the Malayalees, Gujeratis, Marwaris and even Englishmen to the Andhras. Are the Andhras the natural heirs to the rights of these communities in Madras? The Andhras have no nearer kinship nor closer associations with them than the Tamils. These communitees have not voted for handing over Madras to the Andhras or even for partitioning the city and giving a half of it to the Andhras.

The Claim to North Madras

Mr. Ramadas Pantulu says that "the northern portion of ths city of Madras i. e. the portion to the north of the river Cooum, comprising George Town contains a very large Andhra population. Andhras in that part of the city possess large trading and commercial interests and I am sure that if a plebiscite is taken in this part of the city the verdict will be in favour of the capital of the Andhra province being located in the city of Madras".

Let us analyse this confused mixture of pleas and arguments: There are three points here: (1) that north Madras, comprising George Town, contains a very large Andhra population; (2) the Andhras have very large trading interests there; (3) a plebiscite in this part of the

city will secure a vote for the location of the capital of the Andhra province in Madras.

As regards (1) north Madras comprises not merely George Town, but also Royapuram, Washermenpet, Tondiarpet etc., though Mr. Ramadas for obvious reasons leaves them out of the picture. Is it proposed to add only George Town to the Andhra Province or the whole of North Madras? In the latter case, the population not merely of George Town but also of these other divisions must be taken into account. Even in George Town, Mr. Ramadas could only say there is a very large Andhra population, but he does not venture to say that the Andhra community is larger than the Tamil. (2) In regard to the trading and commercial interests of the Andhra residents of George Town, these interests do not outweigh the interests of other communities. Our impression is that the bulk of the Indians' share of trade and commerce in George Town is in the hands of non-Andhras, the Tamil speaking Mohamedans, Marwaris and Gujeratis. Granting that the Andhras have large trading interests there, these interests will be as safe in the future Tamil Province as under the present Government. At any rate the Andhra merchants of George Town are, let us hope, too sensible to put forth the absurd claim that their interests can be safe only if they are transferred to the Andhra Province. (3) As for the Plebiscite that Mr. Ramadas suggests, he very cleverly limits it "to this part of the city" meaning thereby

George Town. Perhaps it would suit him better if it were limited to certain streets largely inhabited by Telugu speaking Vaisyas. We are not sure that even this part of George Town will vote for a transfer to the Andhra province. But the fate of a city cannot be decided by such a narrow plebiscite. For, what is the issue on which plebiscite is to be taken? Surely it is not simply the location of the Andhra capital in Madras which will be in the Tamil Province, but the cession of North Madras to the Andhra Province carrying with it all that part of the Tamil Nadu that lies between Madras and the southern border of Andhra Desa. When the question is thus put, the procedure envisaged by Mr. Ramadas will be seen to be patently unfair. In the first place a city is a unity, an organic whole which cannot be sundered at the bidding of sectional interests. Secondly, North Madras is not contiguous to the Telugu Districts and there is a broad belt of land inhabited mostly by Tamils separating Madras from the nearest Telugu District and this tract cannot be summarily handed over to the Andhras because they have some trading interests in Madras. Lastly, the absurdity of taking a sectional plebiscite to settle the future of a cosmopolitan city will be patent if the principle is pressed to its logical conclusion. On the same principle the Gujeratis may ask that their peta (the part of the city where they preponderate) should be cut off from the rest of the city and tacked on to distant Gujerat.

II

The historical basis of the claim
A moderate statement of the Andhra case for Madras

Mr. Ramadas sums up his case for Madras thus "Many communities were responsible for the founding and development of the city of Madras in relation to its trade, commerce, social and political pre-eminence. The contribution of the Andhras in this endeavour has not been negligible". It is not our case that the Andhras have not contributed to the founding and development of Madras. They had their share, perhaps a considerable share. But had the Tamils no share in this? It is not as if the Andhras built up a rich and flourishing city in a desert by their sole enterprise. The city is situated in Tamil Nadu, is peopled largely by Tamils, it incorporates the ancient Tamil town of Mylapore and the rich and flourishing Portuguese settlement at San Thome. In the light of these facts could it be said that for the prosperity of Madras the Tamils contributed less than the Andhras who migrated to it?

The Andhras cannot ask that the city should be handed over to them simply because their contribution to its building up has not been negligible. Nor can it be parcelled out among the communities that contributed to it in proportion to their respective shares. It must remain one and united and remain a part of Tamil Nadu to which it justly belongs.

Sir S. Radhakrishnan in his presidential address to the Twentieth Session of the Andhra Maha Sabha puts forth the same plea as Mr. Ramadas. He says "the city has had for a long time important Andhra affiliations. In its origin and development, the Andhras have played a great part. It seems to be the most natural centre for the Andhra Province". Sir S. Radhakrishnan is rather shaky in his history, but we have a right to expect sounder logic and greater fairness from a philosopher of his eminence. To justify the Andhra claim to Madras it is not enough to prove that the city has had important Andhra affiliations but that it has had closer and longer affiliations with Andhras than with Tamils, which he has made no attempt to prove. The real reason behind the sudden Andhra demand for Madras is neither the claims of history, nor of population but the need to allay the apprehensions of the Ceded Districts. Says Sir Radhakrishnan "All these difficulties (the difficulties raised by the Ceded Districts) could be obviated if Madras is made the capital of the future Andhra Province. Madras occupies a fairly central position and serves as a link between the Ceded districts and the coastal districts". So to win over the reluctant Rayalaseema the Andhras have to snatch Madras from the Tamils and the so-called historical grounds are merely a cloak of respectability to cover an annexation.

The extreme statement of the Andhra case

Mr. Vavilla Venkateswarlu, the Tamil speaking champion of the Andhra cause, states, the Andhra claim

in a more extreme form. Referring to the circumstances of the founding of the English settlement at Madras and to the services of the Andhras to the East India Company, he says rather in grandiloquent terms "If any set of people has a claim to call Madras their city, it is the Telugus. It is a Telugu city". (Welcome Address to the Twentieth Session of the Andhra Maha Sabha). Before we examine in detail Mr. Venkateswaralu's history of Madras, we should like to explain the limitations of any appeal to history for the settlement of such boundary disputes. If existing provinces are to be cut up and remade according to historical associations, what period of history are we to consider, ancient, medieval or modern? For the areas and boundaries of kingdoms have changed from time to time, the kingdoms expanded and contracted, and dynasties rose, flourished and fell. Moreover, the kingdoms were often named after the ruling dynasties and not after the countries over which they ruled. Thus there were neither Telugu kingdoms nor Tamil kingdoms nor Kanarese kingdoms, but the Cholas, Pallavas, Chalukyas Rashtrakutas, Hoysalas etc. Even the Vijayanagar kingdom was named after the capital city and was not called a Kanarese empire or Telugu empire. Except the Pandyan and Chera kingdoms which were exclusively Tamil, no other kingdom comprised territory inhabited by a homogeneous population speaking one language. For example, the Chola and Pallava kingdoms, though predominently Tamil extended for centuries over a large part of what is now called Telugu

country. The greater part of the Vijayanagar empire was Tamil country. If on the ground that for less than three centuries a dynasty of Andhra kings exercised either direct sway or suzerainty over the Tamil country of Tondaimandalam in which Madras is situated, the Andhras can claim Madras, the Tamils with greater reason can claim the southern portion of Nellore District up to the river Pennar and the southern portion of Chittoor District up to the Tirupathi Hills, as, for nearly a thousand years this part of the country was ruled by the Tamil Pallava and Chola Dynasties. Because the Nayak kings ruled for a century in the Madura, Tanjore and South Arcot districts the Andhras could well ask for them and by the same logic since Vengi was a province of the Chola Empire in the 10th, 11th and 12th centuries the Tamils can ask for the Krishna and Godavari Districts. Now this is history run amock. The only rational and equitable principle on which new boundaries can be drawn so as to produce peace and contentment is the linguistic and cultural affinities of the people inhabiting the area. History has its legitimate use in finding out not what king ruled over a territory but what language and culture predominated there. To dig up worm-eaten arguments out of ancient history would lead to endless confusions and the clash of claims and counterclaims; it would lead to the Tamils claiming the whole of the Madras Presidency and even beyond, to the Maharattas claiming Tanjore, the Kanarese claiming all the area that once

formed part of the Hoysala Empire. If the Andhras want history they shall have it with a vengeance, but wisdom does not lie that way.

Having all these difficulties in mind, the Congress has only approved the redistribution of provinces on a *linguistic* basis. There is no Congress sanction for a redistribution on a historic basis. So the present agitation of the Andhras for Madras and a part of Chinglepet is not only unauthorised by the Congress but against the principles laid down by it. It is time that the attention of the Congress authorities is drawn to the activities of the Congress leaders in Andhra Desa which run counter to the policy of the Congress in this regard and are calculated to promote discord between Andhras and Tamils.

Moreover, the resolution of the Madras Legislature which had the support of the Ministry and of all parties only recommends the formation of separate provinces for the four main language areas. It only means that the area which is predominantly Telugu should be formed into a Telugu province and it cannot be taken to express approval of a proposal to add a predominantly Tamil area to the Telugu province.

The History of Madras

Now what is this history which is supposed to make Madras a Telugu city? Says Mr. Venkateswaralu "The

Telugus were closely associated with the founding of Madras by the English. It was a Telugu chief who made the original grant and it was a Telugu king who ratified it" This Telugu chief was Damerla Iyyappa, the Nayak of Poonamalli, brother of Damerla Venkatadri the Nayak ruler of Wandiwash, and the Telugu king was Sri Ranga Raya of Aravidu dynasty who ruled over the crumbling remains of the Vijayanagar Kingdom from Chandragiri. This Damerla Venkatadri was one of the local chieftains called Nayaks, who had come into existence during the latter period of the Vijayanagar Empire and ruled over small principalities subject to the nominal suzerainty of the Emperor. Now this Wandiwash Nayak though he was an Andhra like the Nayaks of Madura, Tanjore and Gingee, ruled over an admittedly Tamil country, the Coast Country from the Pulicat to Palar. The site granted by him to the East India Company was in the midst of Tamil villages bearing Tamil names and adjoining the ancient Tamil village of Triplicane and the ancient Tamil Town of Mylapore. The strip of land granted to Francis Day by the Nayak of Poonnamallee was a small area extending along the seashore from the mouth of Cooum to an undefined point beyond the present harbour somewhere in the neighbourhood of Cossimodu and inland as far as Cochrane's Canal (Glyn Barlow The Story of Madras). This area covers but a small fraction of the present City of Madras, and much the greater part of it was acquired from time to time by the East India Company from the various Muhammadan Kings

that successively claimed sway over this part of the Coromandal Coast.

The village of Triplicane was granted to the Company by the representatives of the Muhammadan King of Golconda who captured the last remnants of the Vijayanagar Kingdom. Later the Emperor Aurangzeb made a grant of Tandira (Tondiarpet), Persevacca (Pursuvalkam) and Yegmore (Egmore) to Governor Elihu Yale. Still later in the reign of Aurangzeb's son and successor the village of Lungambacco (Nungambakkam) was granted to the Company together with four adjoining villages for a total annual rental of 1500 pagodas. It is very significant that Mr. Venkateswarlu should suggest that the name Nungambakkam is probably derived from a later Andhra merchant Lingappa, though the name Lungambacu occurs in the original grant. The villages of Vepery and Perambur were acquired by the company from the Nawab of Arcot in 1742 and Mylapore in 1749. So out of the 27 Sq. Miles which make up Madras only a few hundred acres were granted by a Telugu prince and on this Mr. Venkateswarlu bases his stupendous claim that Madras is a Telugu city. Even this claim, flimsy as it is, is cancelled by the later history of Madras. For the Raja of Chandragiri was dethroned by the Sultan of Golconda in 1646, only a year after the grant of the land was ratified by him, and the East India Company, nervous about their title, secured a fresh title to their possessions from the Sultan. The latter

was dethroned by the Emperor Aurangazeb who appoinaed a Nawab of the Carnatic in 1687. The East India Company, again secured a fresh title from a representative of the Emperor. So the last persons from whom the Company got the site of Modern Madras were the Muhammadan rulers of the Carnatic, and thus the Andhra boast that it was from an Andhra king that the British got Madras is proved to be baseless.

The origin and meaning of the name "Madras" are still in dispute among historians and one plausible theory is that it came from the portuguese "Madre de deus" Mother of God, from a Christian Church of that name in the Portuguese Settlement at San Thome. The fishing village at the mouth of the river Cooum used to be called Madras-patam and this name the English gave to the town which grew up round their settlement and in course of time this name which originally denoted our modern George Town was extended to the larger city, which was formed by the amalgamation of all the adjacent towns and villages. So the history of the present city of Madras is far older than the name Madras, far older than the Black Town to whose founding and development the Andhras claim to have contributed so much. The Tamil town of Mylapore was famous from ancient times. It was the birth place of Tiruvalluvar, who cannot be placed later than the 2nd century A. D. The temple of Kapaliswara was visited by the Tamil saints Sambandar and Appar whom historians

place in the 6th century A. D. The Vishnu temple at Triplicane is equally celebrated in the Vaishnava Sacred literature and has been sung about by several of the Alwars. Then again there was the rich and populous Portuguese settlement at San Thome. Here is a description of the Portuguese town of San Thome from the pen of an anonymous Portuguese writer quoted by the historian Heras. "San Thome is a very rich and noble city inhabited by the Portuguese— Thus the city was formed which besides the wealth and food that the land produced is nicely fitted for trading and sending its goods to any part of the world". (Fr. Heras, the History of the Aravidu Dynasty p. 68). Again, "San Thome traded specially with the Kingdoms of Pegu and Bengal. The trade of San Thome was also famous throughout Portugal for the beautiful cloth of different kinds coming from the Coromandal Coast". We may incidentally mention that Coromandal is only a corruption of Solamandalam. It is a mistake therefore to suppose that the whole of the present city of Madras stands on the site granted to the English by the Telugu Chief and built up and developed with Telugu wealth and enterprise.

On the small site granted to them by the Poonamalli Nayak the East India Company built a fort and adjoining this fort on the northern side there grew up a settlement of Indian traders, brokers, artisans, etc., called by the English "Black Town". The original Black Town extended only from the northern wall of the fort to what is now Esplanade

Row. It is this part of the town to the building up of which the Telugus may claim to have contributed a great share. This town was destroyed by the French during their occupation of the fort in 1746 and then the new Black Town, now George Town, rose up in its present site.

An Andhra gentleman with more zeal than discretion once pointed to the Telugu names of certain streets and pettas like Govindappa Naick Street and Peddu Naick Pet as proof of Andhra dominance in George Town. For every one street that bears a Telugu name we can point out at least three streets that bear Tamil names. As every one knows street names have curious histories and the character and composition of the people living in a street cannot be read out from its name. If that were so Washermenpet should be peopled wholly by washermen.

History of Tamil Nadu.

So on the score of historical origin or historical associations the Andhras can only claim part of George Town as Andhra in origin. Grant that it was a Telugu prince, vassal of a Telugu king that granted the site on which George Town stands. What title does it confer on the present Andhras for a city that was always a part of Tamilnad and is peopled by a majority of Tamils. From time immemorial this part of South India was considered a part of Tamil Nadu. Vincent Smith, a historian who cannot be accused of partiality for Tamils, writing long before the

Andhra agitation says in his 'Early history of India', "the region covered by the Modern Madras Presidency excluding Northern Circars, Districts of Vizagapatam and Godavari and including the native states of Mysore, Cochin and Travancore is essentially the land of the Tamil race and speech, and accordingly the greater portion of it was known in ancient times as Tamilakam or the Tamil country. The earliest tradition fixed the northern boundary of Tamilakam on the east coast at Pulicat, a little above Madras, and on the west coast at the White Rock near Badagara, the frontier line between these two points passing round the hill of Venkata or Tirupathi. Later traditions extended the north eastern boundary as far as Nellore on the north Pennar river" –P-456.

In the time of Ptolemy only one language, the Tamil, was spoken over the whole area, Malayalam not having been developed as a separate language until some centuries later (Ibid P-457). "According to tradition, the Chola country (Chola Mandalam) was bounded on the north by the Pennar and on the south by the southern Vellaru river; in other words it extended along the east coast from Nellore to Pudukottai (P. 480). These traditional boundaries did not always coincide with the political histories of the Chola kingdom, which varied from time to time but they show without doubt what was generally considered to be Tamilakam, the land predominantly peopled by the Tamils. Here is a very significant statement by Smith "the limits of

the Chola Country as determined by tradition, mark ethnic rather than political frontiers on the north and west, where they do not differ widely from the lines of demarcation between the Tamil and the other Dravidian languages Telugu, Canarese, Malayalam and Tulu" (P. 480). It means that these traditional boundaries define the country peopled by the Tamil speaking people. From prehistoric times down to the conquest of Tondaimandalam in 1377 by Kumara Kempana son of Bukka the founder of Vijayanagar, this part of the country was under Tamil kings, the Cholas, the Pallavas, then again the Cholas, and for a short period the Pandiyas. The kingdom of the Cholas was familiar by name to Katyayana and recognised by Asoka as independent. The north pennar was probably the northern Chola frontier in the Maurya age (Vide Map of Asoka's Empire in 250 B. C. P. 170 of Vincent Smith). Under Karikala who seems to have lived in the second half of the first century A. D., the kingdom of the early Cholas reached the zenith of its power and tradition says that he erected his tiger emblem on the Himalayas. In the second or third century after Christ the power of the Chola kings declined and was superseded by the rise of the Pallavas. The earlier known documents of the dynasty, certain copper plate grants found in the Guntur district, show that the dominions of the early Pallava kings extended to the Krishna river. When Hiuen Tsang visited South India in 640, Narasimhavarman ruled over the mighty Pallava kingdom with his capital at Kanchi and the kingdom of Chola was a restricted territory

estimated to be 400 or 500 miles in circuit, which Mr. Smith identifies with a portion of the Ceded Districts and more especially with the Cuddapah District (P. 483). It is significant that Hiuen Tsang calls the country of which Kanchi was the capital by the name of Dravida. It corresponded therefore very closely with the traditional Chola country between the northern pennar and the southern Vellaru rivers. This Narasimhavarman whom we have just now mentioned, defeated the Chalukya monarch Pulikesin II in 642 capturing his capital Vatapi and extended his jurisdiction far into Mysore and Deccan. The decline of the Pallavas in the latter half of the 8th century gave the Cholas an opportunity of recovering their power and glory. From the middle of the 9th Century to the close of the 13th Century, for more than four centuries, the Cholas were the greatest power in South India. The Chola empire whose foundations were laid by Vijayalaya, Aditya and Parantaka was consolidated and extended by Rajaraja the Great, who became beyond dispute the Lord Paramount of Southern India, ruling a realm which included the whole of the Madras presidency, Ceylon and a large part of Mysore". His son, Rajendra I, surnamed Gangaikondan, extended his conquests further, and annexed the whole kingdom of Pegu to the Chola Empire, and carried his victorious arms to the banks of the Ganges. The glory of the dynasty remained undimmed under Kuloththunga I who ruled his extensive dominions for forty nine years (1070-1110). He reconquered Kalinga a feat celebrated in the Tamil poem Kalingathuparani. His successors

to the time of Kulothunga III succeeded in maintaining the predominant position of his dynasty. The inscriptions of Kulothunga III are found as far north as Nellore at the beginning of the 13th Century. The chieftain of Nellore then known as Vikramasimhapura was a feudatory of the Cholas, and Nellore is described in the contemporary records as belonging to the Pedai Nadu subdivision of Sidikula Manikkavala Nadu of the province Jayamkonda Sola Mandalam (Tondaimandalam). The family of Yadavarayas at Kalahasti and the Sambavarayas of Kanchipuram and Virinchipuram (in the North Arcot) were also feudatories of the Chola King. Kuloththunga III handed down his kingdom practically intact to his successor Rajastaja III (1216) and his records are found as far north as Cuddapah (S. K. Iyengar's South India and her Mohamedan Invaders). He warred against the Telugu Choda Chiefs of Nellore (Timmasiddhi and Manma Siddhi) who had captured Kanchi, and carrying the war into the districts of Nellore and Cuddapah reasserted his suzerainty. The Telugu Shoda kings Vijayaganda Gopala (1250–1292) and Viraganda Gopala continued to be subordinate to the authority of the Cholas and afterwards to the Pandya Jatavarman Sundara Pandya. After the disintegration of the Chola kingdom the Pandyas gained for a time the upper hand in South India until 1310 when the power of all the Hindu states in South India was broken by the invasion of Malik Kafur. Speaking of Jatavarman Sundarapandya who reigned from 1251 to 1271, V. A. Smith says "he made himself master

of the whole eastern coast from Nellore to Cape Comorin" (P. 476). Even Malik Kafur's invasion did not destroy the local dynasties in Chola Nadu and the Sambuvarayars ruled in Tondaimandalam as independent kings with alternative capitals at Kanchipuram and Virinchipuram till about 1370, when they were overthrown by Kumara Kempana of Vijayanagar.

We have narrated the history of South India at some length just to prove our contention that from prehistoric times down to the founding of the Vijayanagar Kingdom in the fourteenth century South India south of N. Pennar was continuously under Tamil rule. Even Venginadu formed only the northern portion of the Pallava dominions. It was the Chalukyan King Pulikesin II who annexed it and placed it under his brother who later declared himself independent and founded the Eastern Chalukyan dynasty with its capital at Rajamahendravaram. In the period of Chola ascendancy, the kings of Vengi were vassals of the Chola emperors, but the Tamils do not propose to ask for the Krishna and Godavari districts on that ground. But our claim to a part of Nellore based on at least 13 centuries of Tamil rule rests on much stronger grounds than the Andhra claim to Madras based on less than 3 centuries of Vijayanagar rule.

Now let us take the Telugu domination in South India. South India was subjugated by Kumara Kempana about 1370 A. D. and till 1646 when the last king of Vijayanagar

was overthrown by the Sultan of Golconda we may say that part of the Tamil Nadu was part of the Vijayanagar Kingdom. Historians are not agreed as to whether the founders of Vijayanagar were Telugus or Canarese, but at least the later dynasties, the Saluva, the Tuluva and Aravidu dynasties were Telugu and it is on this that our Telugu friends base their claim to Madras and a part of Chengalpet. But the question is not what language was spoken by the kings of Vijayanagar but what launguage was spoken by the people who lived in this part of the country. A Persian speaking Mohamedan king ruling over Delhi could not make Hindustan a Persian land nor a Hindustani speaking Mohamedan Nawab from Hyderabad or Arcot make South India Hindustani land. By the same reasoning, a Tamil king ruling over Kalinga or Vengi could not alter the Oriya or Telugu character of those lands and less than three centuries of Vijayanagar rule cannot convert Tamil Nadu to Andhra Desa. Even in the Vijayanagar period of South Indian History, this land was referred to as Tamil Nadu, in records and inscriptions. The Vijayanagar emperors regarded themselves not as rulers of a single country or of a homogeneous people but as kings of Tamil, Telugu and Cannada Nadus. Even in the reign of Krishnadevaraya of happy memory it is recorded that for the administration of these newly acquired dominions he divided the whole country into three parts under three viceroys. The first viceroyalty which extended from Nellore to Coleroon was placed under

Tubaki Krishnappa Nayaka who fixed his capital at Gingee, the second comprising the Chola country was placed under Vijaya Raghunatha who had his capital at Tanjore and the third had his headquarters at Madras (Fr. Heras, the history of the Aravidu Dynasty-Vol. I-Page 112). The same arrangement was continued under his successors and we read that in the reign of Sadasivaraya (and the regency of Ramaraya), in the year 1542 Ramaraya Vithala was appointed Viceroy of South India and during his viceroyalty he lived mostly in Trichinopoly. In the last years of Ramaraya. sometime before the battle of Talikota in 1565 Ramaraya appointed his brother Tirumalaraya as Governor of Vellore and of the whole surrounding country. After the disastrous battle of Talikota, Tirumala the regent removed his capital from Vijayanagar to Penukonda. Even under him the Empire was divided into three viceroyalties to be held by the sons of the sovereign (Ibid P. 254). Here is a very significant statement by Heras, our most reliable authority for the later Vijayanagar kings. "The division was made on *racial* basis and followed the territory of the different peoples that occupied the Empire. The Telugu Viceroyalty in the North, the Kannada Viceroyalty in the west and the *Tamil* Viceroyalty in the south" Sri Ranga Raya was the Viceroy of the whole Telugu country with his Capital nominally at Penukonda though actually the capital of the Telugu Viceroyalty seems to have been at Udayagiri in the heart of the Telugu Country.

"The Tamil country was under the third brother Venkata" (Heras P. 256). "The last of the brothers Venkatapathi" says the Vasucharitra, a Telugu Classic, "was governing as Viceroy the kingdom of Chandragiri". Putting the two statements together we may safely infer that Chandragiri was then part of the Tamil Nadu. The Chikkadevaraya-Vamsavali says that Venkatapathi, the third brother was Viceroy of Tundira (Gingee), Chola (Tanjore) and Pandya (Madura) principalities under feudatory princes with Chandragiri as his Capital. The French Historian Heras says that under Renga I, Venkata his younger brother continued to rule over the Tamil country his capital being Chandragiri (P. 280). Sewell, the Historian of Vijayanagar, mentions 1592 as the date of Venkata's return to the Tamil Country (Sewell I P. 150). A grant of 1596 states that Kanchipuram is situated in the Chandragiri portion of the Tondaimandalam province of the country of Cholamandalam (Heras P. 307). The smallest administrative district then was Kottam (கோட்டம்) which to judge from the distance between Chandragiri and Kanchipuram was not very small. The next higher and larger was the province and the highest was the so called country. The Tamil Viceroyalty probably comprised two countries, the Chola Nadu and the Pandya Nadu. This mode of dividing the country for administrative purposes was made by the Chola Kings and was evidently adopted by the Vijayanagar kings. A trusted minister under Krishna Devaraya was Ambi Aram Valarthan (அம்பி அறம் வளர்த்தான் முதலியார்) and it was he who confirmed the old

division of the northern portion of Tondaimandalam into 20 districts (கோட்டம்) and of each district into smaller units called Nadu (நாடு) and of each nadu into villages (நத்தம்). It is a fortunate circumstance that a well-known Tamil poet Padikkasu Pulavar (படிக்காசுப் புலவர்) who lived in the court of Tirumalai Naik of Madura in the 17th century has mentioned these districts by names and among them are Puzhal (புழல்) Eekkadu (ஈக்காடு) Vengatam (Tiruppathi, (திருப்பதி) and Vellore. Puzhal and Eekkadu were in that part of Chengalpet district which is now demanded by the Andhras, and Madras fell within Puzhal. It is interesting to note that Puzhaleri (புழலேரி) the Red Hills Tank – which supplies water to Madras takes its name from this District. In Puzhal District (புழல்கோட்டம்) there were five Nadus corresponding to our modern taluqs of which one was Egmore (எழும்பூர்). Perambur, Vyasarpady and Pursawalkam were villages in the Egmore Taluq and Ayanpuram, Teynampet, Mylapore, Nungambakkam and Amainthakari (Aminjikarai) were in the Nadu i.e. taluq of Porur. So all the villages which went to form the town of Madras were Tamil villages, bearing Tamil names in the Puzhal district of Tondaimandalam which was a part of the TAMIL VICEROYALTY. Because part of a Tamil village was granted to the English by a Telugu speaking chief of a Tamil District, the whole city of Madras does not become Telugu either in its historical associations or in its present character and composition. To sum up, it cannot be repeated too often that the invasions and conquests of Indian kings were

mostly for personal aggrandisement and not attempts by one people to subjugate or enslave another people, though popular sympathies have been enlisted in a few cases, but had their origin in the personal or dynastic ambitions of kings, that Tamil kings like the Cholas fought with other Tamil kings like Pandyas, that the conquests of Vijayanagar embraced Tamil Telugu and Canarese parts of South India and the kings never felt that they were Telugus imposing Telugu rule over Telugu people. There was nothing like an external title passed on to the Andhras for possesion of all the lands included at one time or another, as within that kingdom. If the claim to Madras should be based on a supposed right of reversion to the last owner then Madras should be handed back to the descendants of the Nawabs of Arcot, and the Circars and the Ceded-Districts to the Nizam. If the fantastic claims of the Nizam are opposed on the very sound principle the sovereignty rests with the people and they cannot be transferred from one rule to another like property, how can the wishes of the people of Madras be ignored in settling this question? Verdict of majority can only be one.

There is a ring of pride in Mr. Venkateswaralu's tone when he says " It was a Telugu chief who made the orginal grant and it was a Telugu king who ratified it". The gift of Madras to the East India Company is not a transaction over which Indian patriots need feel any

particular pride. Apart from that we have shown how the original grant comprised only a part of Modern George Town, and even this grant had to be confirmed by the Mohamadan kings. In regard to the development of Madras Mr. Venkateswarlu after much painstaking research compiled a history of the Telugu gentlemen who assisted the East India Company to build up its trade, with their Dubashes, Brokers, Pandits and Interpreters like Beri Timmanna, Beri Timmappa, Pedda Venkatadri, Chinna Venkatadri and others. We dare say they were all able and estimable gentlemen in their own way and peace be on their souls. But it would be the grossest exaggeration to say that these brokers and Dubashes and their kin and the various clerks were mainly responsible for the growth in population and prosperity of Madras. If we cared we could compile an equally long, perhaps a longer list of Tamil worthies, Beri Chettiars, Mudaliars and Pillais who served the East India Company with distinction, but we do not build up our claim to Madras on such flimsy grounds, for our case rests on the sound basis of present population and past historical associations. Mr. Venkateswarlu recalls with pride that in the 18th century also, the Andhras were equally prominent in the life of Madras and cites the cases of Timmappa and Angarappa who were Pedda Naicks, that is, chiefs of the Police and Watchmen. Ramappa was the chief Dubash of the Company for a time and Ankanna its chief broker for a time, a record of achievemsnts of which Mr. Venkateswarulu seems

to be inordinately proud. This is a fair summary of the Andhra contribution to the development of Madras, a contribution which in Mr. Venkateswarlu's estimation far outweighs the contributions of the Tamils to the development of their own city and makes Madras a Telugu city.

It is not possible to argue with a gentleman whose logic and history are so distorted by self-interest but we have said enough to convince the disinterested public and the open-minded among the Andhras that the Andhra claim to Madras whether judged by the principle of population or by historic affiliations is not only untenable but also fantastic. The Tamils cannot and will not allow their city to be divided and partitioned.

But what about the Telugus in Madras it may be asked. They have lived for centuries in the midst of Tamils without suffering either in their material interests or in their social relations, unlike Andhradesa in which the Tamilian is made to feel that he is an unwelcome alien. Tamil Nadu from ancient times has kept its doors hospitably open to migrants from Andhradesa and has given them equal opportunities with her own sons. The Reddis, the Nayudus, and the Komatis in Tamil Nadu form some of the richest and most influential communities in the country. In all the Telugu districts there are only 337, 320 Tamils as against 14,776,859 Telugus and if we leave out the Tamils in the Chittore District, which is really a part of Tamil-

Nadu, the number of Tamils in Andhradesa will be negligible. And against this handful the Andhras have been making a hue and cry raising up the bogey of a Tamil invasion of Andhra country. As against this the number of Telugu speaking people in Tamil Nadu is 2, 943, 597, nearly a sixth of the total population. Have these millions ever made any complaint against Tamils of Linguistic prejudice or racial discrimination? So while the small population of Tamils scattered in Andhra Desa have real cause for apprehension and alarm, the Andhras of Madras need have no anxiety about their future in Tamil Madras.

The Andhra Case for Chengalpet:— We have refuted the Andhra case for Madras at length, as the Andhra claim for the northern portion of the Chengalpet District is only consequential to their demand for Madras. With the failure of their case for Madras, they may not even press their demand for this portion of Chengalpet. They had some shadow of an excuse for asking for Madras, they have not even this shadow of a justification for asking for this area which traditionally and historically belongs to Tamil Nadu and is peopled mostly by Tamils. Mr. Ramadas Pantulu is conscious of the weakness of his case, for he is halting and fumbling unable to find a single sound argument. Referring to the tract in Ponneri and Tiruvellur taluqs which he wants to be added to the Andhra Province, an area of roughly 1000 sq. miles, (bounded on the west by the eastern border of the Chittore District on the north by the southern border of the

Nellore District and on the south by the Madras-Arkonam railway line), he says he has no precise data to determine the linguistic composition of the population of the area, but admits that his general impression is that the Tamil population preponderates over the Telugu Population. But he says there are contiguous villages—he does not say how many—in the Trivellore taluq which preponderate in Telugu population. But this fact can never justify the Andhra demand, for these villages are not contiguous to the admittedly Telugu country, and they cannot be added to the Andhra Province unless for their sake we sacrifice a much larger number of Tamil villages. Mr. Ramadas Pantulu says "the population of this area speak Tamil as well as Telugu and they have many affinities in their social habits and customs". An excellent reason why they should remain where they naturally belong, namely Tamil Nadu. In fact, if the plebiscite is taken among the Telugus settled in Tamil Nadu, we are confident that a majority of them would vote against the unreasonable demands of the Telugus of Andhra Desa. Mr. Ramadas says, "some adjustments are inevitable in partitioning the province of Madras into linguistic components and this bit may legitimately be added to the Andhra province, because it is a tract with peculiar characteristics and which will go more appropriately into the Andhra province, especially if the claim to locate the Capital of the Andhra Province also in Madras prevails". For utter inconsequence and unreason this sentence is hard to beat. In partitioning our province into linguistic divisions

some slight accommodation may be necessary, but the Andhra conception of the accommodation is that the Tamils should always give everywhere and the Andhras take. The Tamilian claim to the southern portion of Chittore though supported by very strong historical reasons, Mr. Ramadas brushes aside with contempt, as a demand that is utterly untenable. But he would like the Tamils to hand over to the Andhras 1000 square miles of Tamil country peopled by lakhs of Tamils. The Andhras must have all the land to which they have a just claim, and in addition some areas like Chittoor and Tirupathi to which their claim is doubtful and some more like Madras and Chengalpet to which they have absolutely no claim, merely to round off the Andhra Ppovince and provide it with a ready made Capital. "This little bit"- a 1000 sq. miles is a little bit to Mr. Ramadas—"may legitimately be added to the Andhra Province". Mr. Ramadas has very curious notions of legitimacy, for there can be nothing more illegitimate than adding to the Andhra province an area which from time immemorial has been a part of Tamil Nadu and whose population is preponderantly Tamil. "It is a tract with peculiar characteristics and which will go more appropriately into the Andhra province" says Mr. Ramadas, but he does not explain what those peculiar characteristics are: they must be very peculiar indeed to make a Tamil area go more appropriately into the Telugu Province than to its own natural place in the Tamil province. To such shifts and devices are men reduced when they have to

plead an unjust cause " especially if the claim to locate the Capital of the Andhra province also in Madras prevails". A neat example of circular reasoning—they cannot ask for Madras unless we are willing to cede to them all the country between Madras and Telugu Nadu and they cannot ask for this area unless we are willing to cede Madras.

The truth is they must first establish their claim to this intervening strip of territory before they can ask for Madras, for the cession of Madras will automatically carry with it the surrender of this area. For various reasons the Andhras would like to have their capital at Madras but Madras is not contiguous to the Telugu country. So to make it contiguous they ask for all the intervening territory. This may be clever tactics but there is neither logic nor equity in it. It is robbing a man of his house and then asking him for his garden to make the house more comfortable. As if to clinch his argument Mr. Ramadas says that "this tract was historically a Telugu country ruled by Telugu kings and viceroys". We have shown from irrefutable evidence that this part of the country was never a part of the Telugu country, but that on the contrary it has always been considered as an integral part of the Tamil country. In fact there was nothing like a traditional or historical Telugu country with well-developed. limits, a land sung by Telugu poets as definitely and characteristically theirs, in the sense in which we speak of Tamilakam.

If at all any country can be called the traditional land of the Telugus it is Telingana, the land marked by the three lingas of Draksharama in the north, Sreesaila in the west and Kalahasti in the south. But even this would be an encroachment upon the historic Tamil land for later tradition fixed the northern boundary of Tamil land at North Pennar whereas there is absolutely no evidence to show that the Telugu country ever extended south of Kalahasti. If Mr. Ramadas means by Telugu country the country with preponderant Telugu population it is opposed to all the facts to say that this area was ever part of the Telugu country. If he means by Telugu country a country traditionally accepted as the homeland of the Telugus, then also this area was never considered as part of Telugu country. Mr. Ramdas may forget or conceal these patent facts of history, but history cannot be silenced as it proclaims in no uncertain voice that Chengalpet ever was part of the Tamil Nadu and it shall ever remain so.

As for its being under the rule of the Telugu kings and viceroys, that is absolutely irrelevant to the point at issue. As we have clearly shown in the previous pages, the question is not which dynasty ruled over the country but what was the race of people that lived in the country. Even on this point, we urge that less than three centuries of dominition by Telugu-speaking kings cannot outweigh the two thousand years of Tamil rule.

Now that the Andhras have linked the question of Trivellore and Ponneri to that of Madras it becomes doubly our duty to resist their claim to Madras, for on the fate of North Madras depends the future of a thousand square miles of Tamil Nadu and of lakhs of Tamils. If in a moment of weakness or generosity we yield on the question of north Madras, then we shall be handing over to the Andhras a fair slice of the Tamil country without the consent of the people inhabiting it.

The Tamil Claim to the southern portion of Nellore and Chittoor Districts

At the outset we must say that if the boundaries are delimited strictly on language basis we admit we cannot ask for these areas. For whatever their past historical affinities and associations. they are now preponderently Telugu in population. Unlike the Andhra leaders who have one logic for themselves and another for others, who shift their standards to suit their self-interest appealing now to past history and now to the linguistic composition of the present population, we will abide by one rule, one test, one standard, and the standard that commands itself to reason, the standard that is laid down by the Indian National Congress – that of population. But if historical grounds also are taken into account, we are not afraid, for historically we are on much stronger ground than the Andhras. If impartial History is to arbitrate between us, we await its verdict with confidence.

But speaking of the Tamil claim for the southern portion of the Nellore District and the portion of Chittoor District up to the Tirupathi Hills, Mr. Ramadas Pantulu says "this claim is so patently untenable as not to require any argument to controvert it. The real test is that of the population speaking the Telugu language and if the census figures of 1931 are accepted as accurate, there is no case for any claim by the Tamils for any part of these two districts" Apply then the same test to Madras and Chengalpet and where are you? In the language of Mr. Ramadas, the Andhra claim to Madras and a part of Chengalpet district "is so patentiy untenable as not to require any argument to controvert it". But the Andhras have been pressing their fictitious claim to Madras and a part of Chengalpet with fanciful reasons and we have had to controvert them at length. The history which they invoked in vain we shall now invoke with stronger evidence to support our case for Nellore and Chittore.

Nellore

We have already shown how from prehistoric times down to the end of the thirteenth century Nellore District, at least south of the Pennar, was part of the Tamil kingdoms of the Chola, Pallava and Pandya dynasties. The very names, Nellore and Pennar, are Tamil words which indicate the long association of the district with the Tamils. Tradition says that the jungle which once covered the land was cleared by the Tamils who brought it under

cultivation. If Sir Radhakrishnan can claim Madras for the Andhras on the score of its Andhra affiliations we can similarly claim Nellore, for even to the present day it has had important Tamil affiliations. The contributions of the Tamils settled in Nellore to the cultural development of the district have not been negligible and we may cite in support of our statement, the contributions of the late Vedam Venkatroya Sastriayar, of Sir Alladi Krishnaswami Aiyar, Prof. M. Venkatarangiah and our own friend Mr. Vavilla Venkateswaralu and his father, the late revered V. Ramaswamy Sastrulu.

Chitoor

Our case for Chittoor rests on very strong historical and cultural affiliations. As we have shown earlier, the traditional limits of Tamilakam always extended up to Vada Venkatam or Tirupathi. In the Tolkappiam (தொல்காப்பியம்) the earlist grammar of Tamil, a work assigned to the middle Sangam age which cannot be later than the 1st century A. D., the northern boundary of Tamil Nadu is stated to be Vada Venkatam and the southern, Cape Comorin. Ilango Adigal (இளங்கோ அடிகள்) the author of that great Tamil classic Silappadikaram (சிலப்பதிகாரம்) second century A. D. gives the same account. Sikhandi Munivar (சிகண்டிமுனிவர்), Bhavanandi, the author of the standard Tamil grammar Nannul (நன்னூல்), Kamba, the greatest poet of Tamil literature and Sekkilar, (சேக்கிழார்) all define Tamil Nadu in the same term "from Venkatam

(Tirupathi) in the north to Cape Comorin in the south". Kamba gives the specific boundaries of Thondaimandalam (தொண்டைமண்டலம்) thus:—the Pavazha hills in the west Vengatam in the north, the sea in the east and the Pennar in the south. As recently as 300 years ago Padikkasu Pulavar (படிக்காசுப்புலவர்) a poet who lived in the court of the Andhra prince Tirumala Naik of Madura named the districts comprising Tondaimandalam and included Venkatam in the list. So we have an unbroken living tradition, extending from prehistoric times down to the modern period that Tirupathi marks the northern frontier of Tamil Nadu. Against this overwhelming mass of tradition preserved in Tamil literature what evidence can the Andhras produce to show that Tirupathi has been regarded as part of their country. We challenge them to produce an equal volume of authentic reference from early Telugu literature in support of their case. In fact all the literary evidence goes to show that the Telugus regarded as their traditional home either the land lying between the Godavari and Krishna rivers or Telingana, the land lying between the three lingas. The very name Andhra is derived by lexicographers from "Antara" meaning "between", the land lying between the rivers Godavari and Krishna. Their other name, Telugu seems to be etymologically connected with "Telingana". It is significant that Mr. Venateswarlu' should call his Telugu Journal Telingana. So if at all the Andhras can call any land historically their own it is this Telingana.

Now coming to history, we have shown in an earlier section how right up to the time of the Vijayanagar Kings Chittore District was a part of either the Chola kingdom or the Pallava kingdom. It was from a Tamil King, one Sambavaraya, that prince Kumara Kempana of Vijayanagar conquered it about the year 1377. Even under the Vijayanagar kings it was considered a part of the Tamil country. A record of Krishnadevaraya's reign referring to an expedition sent by him to reduce the petty chiefs round about Gingee who had rebelled says, "that the chief of Chittore and other petty rulers of the Tondaimandalam country had an interview with the general Vaiyappa Naik". We have already shown how all this land was constituted into a separate Viceroyalty called the Tamil Viceroyalty with its capital at Chandragiri. This conclusively proves that even under the Telugu kings of Vijayanagar Chandragiri was considered to be within the Tamil country. Several of the inscriptions relating to the Vijayanagar kings speak of Chandragiri as in Tiruvengada Kottam (District) in Vaikuntavala Nadu, a part of Tondaimandalam.

Now coming specifically to Thirupathi, the town owes all its importance to the shrine of Sri Venkateswara on the hill. As a place of pilgrimage it has been famous at least from the beginning of the Christian era for there is a reference to it in Silappadikaram a work of the second century A. D. The earlier Alwars, Peyalwar and Poygai Alwar have sung the praises of the presiding deity, who at the time was conceived

as Siva and Vishnu in one. In the eleventh century the great Vaishnava teacher and reformer Sri Ramanuja settled a dispute about the form of the Godhead worshipped in the temple. All these centuries it was one of the important centres of Vishnavism, a characteristically Tamil cult born in Tamil Nadu, revealed and propagated by Tamil Alwars and Acharyas with an essential part of its sacred literature in Tamil. The very name Tirupathi is a Tamil word originally meaning a sacred place and now limited in application to this holiest of holy places. The present temple at Tirupathi was built by a Yadava prince in 1048 but it only took the place of an older temple which had come from prehistoric times. This was built by the Tamils and liberally endowed by the Tamil kings. The connection of the Andhras with Tirupathi became close only after the conversion of the Vijayanagar kings to the Vaishnava faith and it became closer still after the removal of their capital from Penukonda to Chandragiri, especially under Venkata II. Compared with the reference to Tirupathi and Lord Venkateswara in the Tamil Vaishnava literature, the references to them in Telugu literature are compatatively later and fewer. The connection between Tirupathi and the Tamil language and the Tamil people has been so close and intimate so much so that Pillai Perumal Iyengar a Rayasam under Tirumal Naik, in his hymn to Vekateswara calls Tirupathi the place which fostered the Tamil of the Alwars "ஆழ்வார் செந்தமிழை ஆதரித்த வேங்கடம்". To show that till recent times it was considered essentially

Tamil we may mention that most of the inscriptions in the Temples of Tirupathi and Chandragiri are in Tamil. The language of the inscriptions is always an index of the language spoken by the people of the locality, for an inscription is meant to be read by the people on the spot and not by the distant king or his officers. Even where the donor is a non-Tamilian, the inscription recording his gift is in Tamil, evidently because most of the people in the neighbourhood knew only Tamil. Now all the four inscriptions found in Chandragiri are in Tamil. All the five inscriptions in the Trichanur temple are in Tamil and refer to gifts by Chola kings. Of the 38 inscriptions in the Tirupathi temple two are in Canarese, four in Tamil and Grantha script, one in Grantha, four in Telugu and the remaining twenty-five in Tamil. Take again Kalahasti, a place which owes its sanctity to the Tamil saint Kannappar. In Kalahasti there are 80 inscriptions of which one is in the Nagari script, nine in Tamil and Grantha script combined, one in Telugu and sixty-nine in Tamil. The same is true of Tiruttani. In the Kalahasti Taluq there are two other places of pilgrimage, the villages of Kudipalam and Tondaimanadu. The very names show their Tamil origin. The poet Padikkasu Pulavar definitely mentions Kalahasti as one of the sacred places in Tondaimandalam. In the temple of Kodanda Ramaswami in Tondamanadu there are inscriptions recording gifts by the Chola king Parakesari Varma. There is only one stone inscription in Kudipalam and that is in Tamil. Not only in

these sacred places but even in ordinary villages in these Taluqs are found inscriptions in Tamil. For example, in the village of Puthalapattu in Chittoor Taluq there is an inscription of the year 1438 stating that the village was in Pazhuvur (பழுவூர்) Kottam of Thondaimandalam. We have furnished enough evidence from literary tradition and historical data to prove that the southern portion of the Chittor district up to Tirupathi has always been considered a part of Tamil Nadu. Even under the British this area was part of the North Arcot District till 1911 when for reasons of administrative convenience Chittoor and Tirupathi were seperated from North Arcot and with the Madanapalli division detatched from Cuddapah formed into a separate district. So if historical associations and cultural affinities are to be the determining factor, then the Tamils are on very strong ground in asking for Tirupathi and all the intervening country. The temple is the very life of Tirupathi and the temple is essentially Tamil – the Archakas are Tamil and the forms of worship are those that prevail in Tamil Nadu. All that the Telugus can plead is that the present population of the area is predominantly Telugu, but then in demanding North Madras and a part of Chengalpet they definitely give up the principle of population and take their stand on history and history furnishes irrefutable arguments for our claim to Chittoor and Tirupathi.

In a recent contribution to Swatantra a learned Andhra professor, Dr. N. Venkataramaniya has attempted an

indirect reply to the Tamil claim that Tirupathi is the northern limit of historical and traditional Tamil land. Apart from the fact that his references to ancient Tamil literature are not exhaustive his elaborate display of learning is beside the point for our case. The question is not how far back in Tamil literature do we find clear and categorical references to Tirupati as part of Tamil land, the claim may go back to first century or tenth century, but is there counter-claim in Telugu tradition or literature which is of equal weight? From Mr. Venkataramanaiya's silence we can only infer that there is no clear and continued reference in Telugu literature to Tirupathi as part of Telugu Desa. For at least nine centuries the Tamils have without demur or challenge regarded Tirupathi "Vadavengadam" as the northern limit of Tamil Nadu. If history and tradition are the determining factors, then the Tamils, as was already pointed out, have stronger case for parts of Cittore and Nellore than the Andhras for Madras.